



Task Force Meeting Synopsis March 24, 2008

Task Force Members Present*:

Co-Chair Shirley Lewis, Co-Chair Sam Liccardo, Vice Chair David Pandori, Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Frank Chavez, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Yolanda Cruz, Pastor Oscar Dace, Harvey Darnell, Pat Dando, Dave Fadness, Leslee Hamilton, Sam Ho, Dan Hoang, Nancy Ianni, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Matt Kamkar, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Linda LeZotte, Pierluigi Oliverio, Jenniffer Rodriguez, Dick Santos, Patricia Sausedo, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Neil Struthers, Alofa Talivaa, Michael Van Every, and Jim Zito

Task Force Members Absent

Jackie Adams, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins and Enrique Fernandez

City Staff and Other Public Agencies Present*:

Michael Brilliot (PBCE), Justina Chang (PBCE), Roma Dawson (Councilmember Liccardo's office), Mike Donohoe (Councilmember Cortese's office), Anthony Drummond (Councilmember Williams' office), Peter Hamilton (Councilmember Chirco's office), Joseph Horwedel (PBCE), Stan Ketchum (PBCE), Jessica Garcia-Kohl (Mayor's office), Jenny Nusbaum (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Junko Vroman (ESD), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Ru Weerakoon (Mayor's office), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE)

*As verified by registering attendance on Sign-In Sheets.

1. Welcome and Review of Agenda

Co-Chair Shirley Lewis convened the meeting at 6:34 p.m. Task Force members' attention was directed to information included in the packet regarding attendance policies.

2. Review and Approval of Synopsis of the February 25, 2008 Meeting

The following corrections were requested:

- Request was made that the question regarding the calculation methodology of the RHNA allocation and how San Jose fared in previous time frames also include the query of whether there were any incentives for achieving a high score.

- Transit money and other Bond money are not currently linked with the ability to meet RHNA goals.

The synopsis, as revised, was approved unanimously.

3. Presentation and Discussion of Health and the Built Environment

Lori Martin with the Santa Clara County Health Department and Heather Wooten with the non-profit organization Public Health, Law and Policy spoke on the topic of health and the built environment. Ms. Martin began by presenting a statistical overview comparing San Jose to County, state and national averages related to obesity, healthy eating, physical activity, and preferred mode of transportation. Public health and the built environment have a correlation. If the built environment does not support healthy behaviors, it's hard to sustain those behaviors. The goal is to make the healthy choice the easy choice. Statistics show that obesity is on the rise. This is because we are not getting enough physical activity, we are not eating fruits and vegetables, and we are a car-centric community. We need a built environment that makes it easy and enjoyable to get physical activity, get out of our cars and walk or bike, and we need fruits and vegetables to be as easily accessible as fast food.

Ms. Wooten continued the presentation showing how health and the built environment are tied together. She emphasized that place matters. The decisions we make about how to develop and how to grow as communities has a direct impact on our health and quality of life. She explained that a healthy community is not defined strictly by the health of its residents. Rather the conditions of the built environment shape behavior and health outcomes. When you create communities designed to support healthy outcomes in one area, you actually have benefits in multiple health areas or interconnected health benefits. San Jose has been planned to be car-centric. Time in cars means we have worse air quality, less time at home and work, less time to exercise or cook healthy meals, and increased stress. She compared Irvine and Philadelphia for walkability and compared and contrasted proximity and connectivity of the two cities. Money invested in transportation infrastructure and our land use decisions translates into activity patterns or travel choices. These choices affect outcomes in terms of air quality, physical activity, even climate change. That, in turn, has economic impacts for public health and the economy at large.

Another issue that has major and often life-long impacts on children's health is air quality. Citing increasing building opportunities near freeways as an example, Ms. Wooten suggested informed and conscientious decisions need to be made in determining housing and school location.

Ms. Wooten further discussed the issue of access to healthy food. Communities that have easy access to fast food but limited grocery stores have increased rates of chronic diseases. She provided information on a study undertaken by the California Center for Public Health Advocacies. San Jose's retail food environment was rated showing over 4.5 times as many unhealthy food retail opportunities as there are healthy food retail opportunities, with fast food restaurants representing 58% of San Jose's food retail environment. This makes the easy choice

Meeting Synopsis

March 24, 2008

Page 3 of 12

the unhealthy choice. Cities can use planning to make the healthy choice the easy choice by using tools such as the General Plan, Zoning controls, transportation and public works, parks and recreation, economic development, and development review. Decisions in these areas form the built environment which has a strong impact on public health. General Plans and Zoning can affect density and mix of land uses, access to and availability of transit, roadway connectivity, the pedestrian environment, access to parks and open space, and access to healthy foods. Zoning can also regulate, and planning policies guide, the location of grocery stores and farmers markets and restrict the density and location of fast food. All of these issues are connected together in terms of health outcomes. Ms. Wooten opined there are major challenges facing communities today that will require creative and cooperative solutions. We need to work across the sectors of transportation, environment and health to solve these problems.

The Task Force members asked questions and provided comment as follows:

Concern was voiced that low profit margin is forcing grocery stores to close, leaving neighborhoods without one. Recommendation was solicited for specific direction the Task Force could take to remedy the situation. *Ms. Wooten indicated there are several factors that contribute to successfully attracting grocery stores, including access to freeways and ample parking. She said areas need to be identified that have this accessibility and then brokers need to be encouraged to consider them. Economic development incentives are often be needed.*

Question was asked regarding the 14% of the retail food market held by supermarkets. How does this compares to other urban areas? Is the 14% a relatively high or low percentage of the total composition. *Ms. Wooten responded that San Jose's percentage is a little higher than California as a whole.*

Support was voiced for the concept of making San Jose a more bicycle and pedestrian friendly community. It was recognized that this will be a challenge. One suggestion was that the Task Force determine how the General Plan can guide the city to reduce vehicle miles traveled. This impacts public health, aging population, climate change and rising fuel prices. How to incorporate that into the General Plan should be the over arching premise in all of the meetings. Recommendation was made for working subgroups within the Task Force to study working across the sectors of transportation, environment, and health and incorporating that into the 2040 General Plan.

Regarding the question of how to attract grocery stores, a view was expressed that one of the key answers is increasing population density because retailers make their decisions based on how many customers are in their trade area. Neighborhoods of appropriate density need to be created to support retail. The greatest opportunity to create these kinds of neighborhoods is in the Specific Plan areas. *Ms. Wooten interjected that retailers not only care about density figures but also dollar figures. They care about buying power as well as density.*

Question was asked if Ms. Wooten had seen examples of cities built out like San Jose, with specific reference to the Santa Teresa area, with a number of cul-de-sacs and a lack of connectivity that have been able to redesign and adapt that. *Ms. Wooten indicated this is not a*

Meeting Synopsis

March 24, 2008

Page 4 of 12

simple problem to solve. One solution is creating pedestrian cut-throughs at the end of cul-de-sacs. The challenge is getting the easements from the property owners and convincing them this is an asset, not a detriment, which will increase property values.

The issue of density on one side of the coin and parking/vehicle accessibility on the other was raised as being counter intuitive in terms of creating denser communities. Ms. Wooten was asked if she was aware of examples as best practices. *Ms. Wooten agreed that the grocery industry has had a hard time trying to determine how to serve urban communities. Since WWII the direction has been toward providing ample parking. We can now see a trend where retailers are trying to relocate in mixed use buildings. She cited Tesco as an example of a smaller grocery store that has successfully located in urban areas with limited parking. She suggested local governments should “court” these types of inventive retailers who are willing to try something different.*

Regarding walkable, attractive environments, suggestion was made to incorporate public art to add to the environment. Question was raised if public art monies had been coordinated with the General Plan or planning to develop public art along public streets and not just within or adjacent to buildings. *Joe Horwedel, Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, responded work is currently transpiring between PBCE and OED on a public art master plan that would incorporate private development. Today public art applies only to public facilities such as Police Stations or Libraries. The result of this joint effort may result in some changes where public art becomes more of an integral part of the trail system.* Question followed regarding physically separated bike lanes from vehicle lanes and whether San Jose has considered this option. Mention was made that there are models of this type of lane design. Clarification was requested on what the city is doing to create a safer and more efficient environment for bikes. *Mr. Horwedel indicated this would be an issue the Transportation staff would need to address. Stan Ketchum further clarified that the transportation consultant would be asked to identify new and creative ways to make San Jose more bike friendly. This is definitely a goal of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Sam Liccardo added that the Valley Transportation Authority 2035 VTA plan process will also develop recommendations on policies and improvements to make the City more bicycle friendly.* It was recalled that the DOT Task Force presentation discussed the possibility that, in some areas, pedestrians and bicycles would be give priority over motor vehicle traffic.

Support was expressed for the idea that parks and open space contribute to a healthy environment. Creating a Central Park in San Jose, similar to New York City’s Central Park, was recommend as a way to encourage social activity and healthy living. The speaker did not agree with the statement that San Jose’s neighborhoods are not walkable and that their design discourages social interaction. It was stated that the City’s neighborhoods are wonderfully walkable. In addition, substantial improvements have been successfully implemented to make the city more bike friendly and more accessible to handicapped people. It was opined that social interaction is a personal choice. It is a mistake for the Government to conduct social engineering to try to change personal choice. There are fast food retailers in San Jose because there is a market for them. It is a personal choice to buy from them. Opportunities need to be made available for our children and neighbors to have a healthy lifestyle but not to intervene in

Meeting Synopsis

March 24, 2008

Page 5 of 12

their choice. It was opined San Jose is wonderful as it is now; we have nothing to be ashamed of; we need to carry that tradition forward.

Another Task Force member said that the City should be careful not to adopt any policies that could discourage the attraction or preservation of jobs. Recommendation was made for better partnerships with entities such as schools and water districts for use of publicly owned land. In developing these partnerships we can create more walkable, open space. Suggestion was made to improve the accessibility of public transit in many the neighborhoods, especially neighborhoods with senior facilities. Regarding the idea of a Central Park, Guadalupe River Park is a wonderful asset to the City. It is underutilized. We need to encourage people to use that park, not just the people who live around it, but residents throughout the city. A project in Salt Lake City was mention as an example of a small improvement that could encourage healthy living. Salt Lake City placed markers in the sidewalk that let people know how far they had walked.

The presentations contrast of Philadelphia and Irvine was commended, and reference made to the indoor, multi-story markets in Philadelphia and Seattle. Bringing local farmers market into permanent structures, as these cities have done, is something that would contribute to the health of the built environment in San Jose. The quality of grocery stores, and not just the number of stores, is important. San Jose has many stores classified as grocery stores whose primary business is the sale of alcohol and tobacco. Recommendation was made to re-categorize this type of retail establishment.

Another member opined bikes represent a great solution to many of the issues being looked at, whether climate change, health, or congestion. There is much more San Jose can do to encourage bicycle riding and to make it safe and enjoyable. Portland was cited as an excellent example where a significant percentage of the population commutes to work by bike because the city has consciously made an effort to accommodate bikers. San Jose is dependent on cars and it will take a huge cultural shift in the community to change that. Also raised was the issue of Guadalupe River Park. The Park could be a destination and a cultural draw by adding more public area and by addressing the homeless problem through the development of more affordable housing.

Another member questioned how health will be addressed in the General Plan, asking if there will there be a “healthy lifestyle” element as well as such elements as transportation and land use. *Staff responded that the specific organization of the General Plan has not been identified. However the issue of health, as well as transportation and land use, will be addressed by the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan.* Suggestion was made that one of the goals of the policy would be to have a specific reduction in vehicle miles traveled as a benchmark going forward. Recommendation was further made for no cul-de-sacs or walled communities. *Laurel Prevetti, Assistant Director, indicated the evening’s discussion was intended to promote different thinking not necessarily to identify specific policies for the General Plan. She indicated as the Task Force thinks about sustainability from a very broad perspective, they will have an opportunity to perhaps address several issues simultaneously, whether it is bicycles, walkability*

or land use. Referring to the inference to sustainability, comment was made that sustainability benchmarks are needed for each of the elements of the Vision.

Response was solicited from Ms. Wooten regarding attracting supermarkets to a highly urban area like the downtown core. Additionally, a request was made for examples of where this has worked and Ms. Wooten's thoughts on the feasibility of this concept in San Jose. *Ms. Wooten addressed the query by sharing an example of a Whole Foods that recently opened in the Lake Merit area of Oakland. This is not a high density area, but one that transitions from downtown to residential neighborhoods. Parking is provided on the roof. Many customers walk there. It is close enough to offices that workers walk there on their lunch hour. It serves retirees and seniors who live in the neighborhood. The business was built within a historic Cadillac dealership and the façade of the building was retained. As part of this project, pedestrian access was improved to the site. This project is a model of a grocery store that broke the barriers of traditional location. From a capitalist perspective, Whole Foods has successfully expanded into a market that does not fit the traditional mold.*

4. Presentation and Discussion on the Habitat Conservation Plan

Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner, explained that the Habitat Conservation Plan is a plan to conserve species and habitats on a large scale, over long term, providing a mechanism to resolve conflict between threatened and endangered species and development while allowing economic development to go forward. Cooperatively working to develop the plan are the County of Santa Clara, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Santa Clara Valley Water District, the cities of Gilroy, Morgan Hill and San Jose in association with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Game and the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Rather than separately permitting and mitigating each individual project, the Plan will look at natural resource impacts and mitigation requirements comprehensively. Instead of applying for permits through several regulatory wildlife agencies, the Plan will allow project applicants to receive permits through local agency Planning Departments. In addition to strengthening local control over land use and species protection, the Plan will provide a more efficient process for protecting natural resources by creating a number of new habitat reserves that will be larger in scale, more ecologically valuable and easier to manage.

Funding sources include State and Federal grants that will become available upon adoption and implementation of the Plan. This money can only be used for more land acquisition not for mitigation activities. There will be impact fees to mitigate the impacts from private development and public agencies. As well, it is anticipated there will be funding from non-profit organizations.

The Plan is still in the early development stages. It is anticipated there will be a draft Plan available in early 2009. Because the Plan falls under the regulations of the State and Federal systems, there is a long review period. It is anticipated the Plan will be adopted somewhere in early to mid-2010.

The Task Force members asked questions and provided comment as follows:

Clarification was requested on slide #2, “Plan to conserve species and habitats on large scale over long term in exchange for permits to ‘take’ threatened or endangered species.” *Ken Schreiber, Project Manager for Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan, responded relating his answer to direct impacts. If the project shows that it will impact a sensitive habitat, the project would need to do two things: 1) Conduct an environmental review and avoid or minimize impacts. 2) Pay fees or dedicate land in lieu of fees. A project can have impacts on the species because the difference is made up by the contributions to the creation of this preserve system in the long run. Under the proposed fee structure, all projects will need to contribute some relative amount of fees toward the creation of the reserve system. Question was asked if infill projects will be required to pay fees. It was clarified they would, though less than the base fee. Question was also asked regarding the voter approved parcel tax that goes toward open space acquisition and how that interfaces with the Plan. Mr. Schreiber indicated the Open Space Authority is one of the local agencies they would like to partner with to use their lands for habitat enhancement and restoration.*

Another member indicated that although Coyote Valley is in the Plan area, it is not subject to the Habitat Conservation Plan. *Mr. Schreiber confirmed that Coyote Valley is not included in the HCP, in accordance with the Planning Agreement. However, the Coyote Valley Specific Plan is subject to the Endangered Species Act and is not prohibited from participating at a later date. Follow up question was asked if Coyote Valley will be made part of the Habitat Plan. Response was that this will be decided by the City Council at a later date.*

Another member registered concern about a tax on infill development, citing the most important environmental benefit is development within our existing city. Additional fees would be a deterrent to infill development. *Staff responded that the fee proposal for infill development is just a proposal and could be dropped or modified. It is not the intention of the Habitat Plan to create a disincentive for what we would consider smart growth.*

It was asked who the final decision makers are. *Staff clarified the six local partners would decide if they wanted to go forward and participate or not. On the approval process, State Fish and Game, Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fishery Service would also be involved in the decision. The adoption process will be a long and thorough process. There will also be an implementing agreement between the wildlife agencies and each of the local agencies that will guarantee the agreement provisions.*

The issue of wildlife corridors was brought up and question asked if they are contemplating the creation of corridors. *Staff responded that the Plan focuses on the linkages as this urban reserve system is created with the hope of strategically linking properties so the species can move between the protected pockets.*

More in depth information on the cost of the program was requested. *Staff indicated that this is an ongoing discussion. The concept currently is that there would be fees levied for both public and private projects. These fees would vary depending on the size of the project and the kinds of*

impacts. The bulk of the urban development impacts would come from Gilroy and Morgan Hill. Therefore, San Jose, because it is only contributing 1,400 acres, would be in a lesser impact fee category than the other two cities. The bulk of the fees will come from Gilroy, Morgan Hill, VTA and the Water District.

Question was asked regarding other established habitat conservation plans within the state and the results of these plans. *Staff responded that the concept is still relatively new. San Diego and Contra Costa have plans and Contra Costa's plan has just been implemented. The HCP will differ from Contra Costa's plan in that we are not dealing with rampant sprawl into the hillsides. Mr. Scheiber added that there have been enough predecessors that we have been able to identify mistakes and learn from them.*

Additional clarification was requested on the cost and who will pay for Plan implementation. A statement was made that it is important that the intended results of the HCP are accomplished, and that there are not unintended results, such as causing more permitting red tape. *Staff responded that, in part, because of such measures as the County's and the City of San Jose's Urban Growth Boundaries and Morgan Hill's Greenline, the HCP is anticipated to achieve its intended results. A Plan will be developed that reinforces existing policies.*

5. Discussion of Task Force recommendation to the City Council to include specific plans within the citywide vision and analysis for the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update.

Stan Ketchum introduced this item referring to the 3/20/08 Memorandum forwarded to the City Council, and specifically the portion of the Memo dealing with review of Specific Plans as part of the General Plan Update. The Council's initial direction to the Task Force was that Specific Plans were not to be discussed. The Task Force felt they needed to be able to discuss and review these Plans as part of the process to develop strategies to accommodate projected growth. The suggestion in the Memo is that the basic vision, scope and direction of the various Specific Plans should remain intact, but that the Task Force should be allowed to include these Plan areas in their discussion about jobs and housing capacity citywide. If recommendations are made that affect any of the Specific Plan areas, staff would seek future Council direction, after completion of the General Plan Update, to initiate updates to such plans, involving interested property owners, businesses and neighborhoods.

The Task Force members asked questions and provided comment as follows:

One member felt it is important to know how much development has occurred in each of the Specific Plan areas and how much capacity remain for new development. *Staff indicated some of that information was addressed in the land use study and there will be additional augmentation of the information as we move forward.*

A follow up question was posed asking what Plans are adopted and which ones are not. *Staff indicated all of the Specific Plans are adopted and incorporated in the current General Plan.*

Clarification was provided by a Task Force member that, when previously recommending that the Task Force be allowed to consider Specific Plans, it was because these areas represent large pieces of the city and it is important to consider them in developing overall goals and objectives for the General Plan. In addition, it is important to understand the mix of uses planned and built in each of the Specific Plan areas as we develop strategies to accommodate ABAG's projected growth for San Jose. The suggestion was not to go back and redo or undo these Plans. Should decisions of the Task Force affect some of the directives of these Specific Plans, it would be critical that the communities are brought back into the process.

Another member felt it would be beneficial to look at the Specific Plans and update them for the 21st Century. Many decisions were based on assumptions of what would occur in the future. Today many of these former assumptions are realities. This information needs to be up to date when making plans to achieve housing and jobs goals.

Following up on this suggestion, it was agreed that it is important to understand what has been accomplished and not accomplished under the current General Plan. The Tamien Specific Plan was used as an example where commercial and jobs were supposed to happen and did not. The Task Force needs to look at those areas where the Plans do not reflect what happened.

Co-Chair Lewis agreed that the Task Force had been provided information on what has been built out in the Specific Plans and what has been approved. However, no information was provided on the remaining development capacity in each of the Specific Plan areas. *Staff responded that a separate analysis is being conducted on the remaining development capacity of each of the Specific Plan areas and that this analysis will be brought to both the Task Force and City Council perhaps in April or May.*

Another member felt it was important to revisit the Specific Plans so they are not out of sync with the General Plan. It was felt this would be of benefit to the community who might be accessing these documents, as well.

A Task Force member said that a number of significant changes have occurred in the Midtown Specific Plan Area that were not envisioned by the Midtown Plan. Such changes included the closing of the Del Monte Cannery. Individual pockets of land and significant developments have been added in that area. It would be helpful to have an analysis of this Plan has been implemented.

One member said that the communities within the Specific Plan areas should be asked, within the Task Force forum, to discuss their desires for their neighborhoods. Perhaps the Task Force could then do a filter of citywide needs and analyze the Plans. There could be tension between what the Specific Plans do for us as a city and what some of the local neighbors want to see in the Plans. The hope would be to balance the local neighborhood perspective with the citywide perspective. *Staff indicated there would be opportunity for community outreach involvement.*

In reference to ABAG projections, Joe Horwedel clarified that we need to decide as a community how much of the growth we want to incorporate into our planning efforts. We need

to determine what the holding capacity of each of the Specific Plans is and treat them just like the rest of the city and decide where we can best accommodate that growth. Some of that perhaps needs to be rethought in Specific Plan areas. We will study our options and consider the various impacts to different areas. We need to have input from these Specific Plan neighborhoods while not losing sight of the citywide task before us.

One member said that, in planning for the future, Specific Plans have to be on the table for discussion. It was interpreted that staff is proposing that the Task Force take a macro view of these Specific Plans and look at overall capacity. It is not clear whether staff's proposal address some of the Task Force members concerns. *Staff responded that when looking at the overall city and where growth needs to be accommodated, Specific Plans will be on the table for discussion. The Task Force will not be looking at the very specific details of the Specific Plans such as building design, set backs, where parks are situated, etc.*

Returning to the subject of built and approved development within the Specific Plan areas, the question was asked if total capacity in the Plan areas equals development built and approved. *Staff explained it did not and that information would be coming to the Task Force for use in the alternatives discussion.* Additional comment was made that most of the Specific Plans are nearly completely built out, with the exception of Communications Hill and other new Plans. The Task Force would not be retrofitting of the built out portions but looking at remaining space and perhaps using it differently.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE TASK FORCE BE ALLOWED TO REVIEW SPECIFIC PLANS SO LONG AS THE BASIC VISION, SCOPE AND DIRECTION OF THE ADOPTED SPECIFIC AREA PLAN SHALL REMAIN IN TACT. Unanimous.

REQUEST WAS MADE THAT THE MOTION BE AMENDED TO ALSO REFLECT PROCESSING OF CURRENT PROJECTS IN THE PLANS WOULD NOT BE IMPEDED. Unanimous.

6. Announcements

Staff referenced other items addressed in the 3/20/08 Memorandum including the growth assessment of the South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve. This will be included in the alternatives discussion.

Reference was made to the letter from Davidon Homes and the response to them. It was explained that the Task Force would not be initiating recommendation to the City Council for proposed expansion to the Urban Growth Boundary. There is a process outside of the Task Force that allows for application if the parcel size is less than 5 acres and can go through a General Plan Amendment process. According to the Municipal Code, parcels over 5 acres must go through a comprehensive update of the General Plan also requiring an application process and legal process.

Discussion ensued for clarification. Recommendation was made to bring the subject forward on a subsequent agenda.

Regarding a point made in the 6/4/07 Council Memo a question was raised as to why, among other issues, historic preservation policies and surveys were not included as a part of the General Plan Update. Recommendation was made to bring the subject forward to another meeting.

7. Public Comment

Attention was called to the fact that public comment was not solicited prior to the vote before the Task Force earlier in the evening. *The omission was recognized and comments welcomed.* Because of the hot housing market, only housing was built in many Specific Plans areas. Commercial space, parks and trails, and retail mixed use were not built. Recommendation was made that the Task Force consider all of the Specific Plans from a capacity standpoint relating not only to housing but other components of smart growth and mixed use transit oriented development.

Recommendation was made that the General Plan create a more biking- and walking-friendly city. Suggestion was made that plastic bags and leaf blowers be outlawed.

Attention was called to the fact that adequate access to health care was not a component of the Health and the Built Environment presentation. This is a very important and current issue for San Jose residents.

Support was voiced for having a separate health element in the General Plan, citing it is too important to be embedded as part of a larger element. Regulations providing for healthy choices is not about social engineering. It is important to have healthy choices available to people so they can live a healthy lifestyle.

Support for the Task Force being allowed to include Specific Plans in the General Plan Update was voiced. As more people are put into smaller spaces, more demands are being put on human nature. Request was made that recreation and open space be integrated into the Plans to accommodate these demands.

Referring to the Health and the Build Environment presentation, suggestion was made that food production be a part of the General Plan Update. This could be accomplished in a number of ways, including community gardens, urban agriculture/farms, and preserving areas like Coyote Valley for food production. Referring to the Habitat Conservation Plan presentation, recommendation was made to include Coyote Valley as a wildlife corridor.

Reference was made to building parking on the top of Whole Foods and how this same concept had been suggested as an alternative in the conversion of IBM Building 025 into a new Lowes facility. Support was voiced for bringing back historic preservation as a topic at a future meeting.

Meeting Synopsis

March 24, 2008

Page 12 of 12

Comment was again made that the Task Force should take another vote, after public comment, on including Specific Plans as part of the Envision San Jose process. Regarding the adjacent and contiguous areas to the Midtown Plan, request was made that the planning staff include an analysis of those properties that have been converted to housing, as well. Reportedly the number of housing units built within the Midtown Specific Plan has already exceeded the lower end of the number of units recommended to be built in the area. In addition, less than half of the park land planned in the Specific Plan has been developed. Request was made to review the amount of commercial and retail development planned and built.

Speaker agreed that there is a strong correlation between the built environment and public health. Studies should be undertaken to look at the preponderance and causes of asthma, cancer, and diabetes within poor communities. Support was voiced for the use of Coyote Valley as agricultural land, community gardens, and the flea market. Request was made that the Task Force take the lead in establishing more sustainable development practices.

Announcement was made that the Land Conservancy is hosting public tours on Coyote Ridge during the month of April. The Task Force was specifically invited to tour on Saturday, April 19 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

One community member spoke in support of saving Coyote Valley. Development is not the most important issue; the needs of people, plants and animals, as well as the air and water take precedent over development. Discontent was voiced for the closure of the San Jose Medical Center, that the city is car-centric, that traffic signals do not recognize bicycles and that traffic signal buttons are not conveniently located for bicyclists.

MOTION WAS MADE TO RECONSIDER THE PREVIOUS VOTE ON SPECIFIC PLANS AND TO INCLUDE 1) ANALYSIS OF THE CONVERSIONS AROUND SPECIFIC PLANS THAT WERE ASSUMED STABLE EMPLOYMENT LAND BUT HAVE NOW BEEN CONVERTED; 2) DETAILED ANALYSIS TO BE COMPLETED ON RETAIL, COMMERCIAL, HOUSING AND INDUSTRIAL IN THOSE TYPES OF SPECIFIC PLANS; 3) CONSIDER THE SPECIFIC PLANS FROM A CAPACITY STANDPOINT RELATING NOT ONLY TO HOUSING BUT OTHER COMPONENTS OF SMART GROWTH AND MIXED USE, TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT.
Unanimous.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Next Task Force Meeting is scheduled for April 28, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.